

Remarks:

This amendment is submitted in an earnest effort to advance this case to issue without delay.

The priority papers were filed with the original application papers and their receipt was acknowledged in the above-mentioned Examiner's Action. The undersigned hereby reiterates the priority claim made in the earlier-filed Declaration.

Claim 1 has been amended slightly to define the invention with somewhat greater particularity over the art. More particularly, the inner sleeve 2 which originally was merely described as "surrounding" the coil 1 is now described as "externally surrounding" this coil 1 and bearing radially inwardly on it. It was thought that the term "surrounding" would imply that the inner sleeve 2 was outside the coil 1, but the current amendments make this clear.

The claims stand rejected mainly on US patent 5,558,888 of Beck. This reference shows a coil 68 sandwiched between an inner sleeve 21 and an outer sleeve 30. Thus there is no inner sleeve that is external of the coil and that bears radially inward on it. Nor is there any teaching that the inner sleeve of Beck is "radially compressible" while the outer sleeve is "radially gener-

ally inextensible." Thus the structure of claim 1 is not seen in Beck and a §102 rejection on this reference is impossible. A §103 rejection is similarly out of the question because Beck nowhere suggests two sleeves outside its coil, with the inner one radially compressible and the outer one radially inextensible.

US patent 5,687,996 of Steinmetz shows only a single sleeve, albeit formed with a notch. Nothing in this reference suggests two coaxial sleeves, an inner radially compressible one and an outer radially, thus this reference adds nothing to Beck to form a valid §103 rejection and of course is unusable in itself for a §102 rejection.

US patent 3,849,630 of Halliday is cumulative to Beck, with two sleeves sandwiching the coil and neither sleeve more or less radially compressible than the other.

The last applied reference, US 6,482,049 of Swearingen has no coil and is actually irrelevant to the instant invention.

Thus all of the claims in the case are clearly in condition for allowance. Passage to Issue is in order.

If only minor problems that could be corrected by means of a telephone conference stand in the way of allowance of this

Atty's 22554

Pat. App. 10/680,845

case, the examiner is invited to call the undersigned to make the necessary corrections.

Respectfully submitted,
The Firm of Karl F. Ross P.C.



by: Andrew Wilford, 26,597
Attorney for Applicant

28 September 2004
5676 Riverdale Avenue Box 900
Bronx, NY 10471-0900
Cust. No.: 535
Tel: (718) 884-6600
Fax: (718) 601-1099

Enclosure: None.